

**DISTRICT ATTORNEY
COUNTY OF NEW YORK
ONE HOGAN PLACE
New York, N. Y. 10013
(212) 335-9000**

OFFICER: LOUIS D'AMBROSIO
TAX NUMBER: 932 513

DISCLOSURE ADVISORY

For the person named above, whom the People may call as a witness, please be advised as follows.

1. The New York City Civilian Complaint Review Board (CCRB) has deemed substantiated allegations that on or about March 5, 2018, Louis D'Ambrosio wrongfully searched a person and wrongfully searched a vehicle for evidence of a firearm after its occupants had already been removed and searched. On March 5, 2018 at approximately 10:25 PM in the vicinity of St. Nicholas Avenue and West 193rd Street in Manhattan, Louis D'Ambrosio and other officers made a stop of a red SUV. They stopped the SUV because it and its occupants fit the description that had been given to other officers of a vehicle that had been involved in a recent incident of shots fired in the vicinity slightly earlier. The occupants were removed from the vehicle and were each frisked when they came out with negative results. The CCRB concluded that Louis D'Ambrosio had improperly searched a person by reaching into that person's pants and jacket pocket after that person had been frisked with negative results. After all of the occupants had been removed from the SUV and frisked with negative results, Louis D'Ambrosio and another officer entered and searched the SUV also with negative results. The officers explained to the occupants of the SUV the reason that they had been stopped and informed them that they were free to leave. The CCRB concluded that the description of the vehicle and its occupants as having possibly been involved in a shooting incident was a sufficient basis for reasonable suspicion to justify the stop of the automobile and a sufficient basis to fear for their safety to justify the officers' frisk of the occupants. The CCRB concluded, however, that, after all of the occupants had been removed from the automobile, the search of the automobile could not be justified by the officers concern for their safety and, absent probable cause, the search was improper. CCRB substantiated the allegation of abuse of authority for the search of the vehicle.
2. Louis D'Ambrosio is a named defendant in the civil action Roger Amaro V. City of New York, et al, docket number 300 875-12, filed in New York Supreme Court, involving an incident that occurred on February 12, 2011.
3. Louis D'Ambrosio is a named defendant in the civil action Jorge Cerda V. City of New York, et al, docket number 155 365/2014 filed in New York Supreme Court relating to an incident which occurred on February 27, 2013.
4. Louis D'Ambrosio is a named defendant in the civil action Juan Alvarez V City of New York, et al, docket number 159 562/2014, filed in New York Supreme Court regarding an incident that occurred on November 21, 2013.

5. Louis D'Ambrosio is a named defendant in the civil action Jonaivy Quezada V City of New York, et al, docket number 161 825/2015, filed in New York Supreme Court regarding an incident that occurred on March 2, 2015.
6. The New York City Police Department (NYPD) has deemed substantiated allegations from October 38, 2020 for Louis D'Ambrosio of Fail to Safeguard-Vouchered Prisoner Property-United States Currency and Fail to Safeguard-Vouchered Prisoner Property-Other Property.

Various publicly available websites and databases contain disciplinary information for certain law enforcement officers. Two of these are online databases maintained by the New York City Police Department (NYPD) (<https://nypdonline.org/link/1026>) and the New York City Civilian Complaint Review Board (<https://www1.nyc.gov/site/ccrb/policy/MOS-records.page>). Information in such databases about this officer is not necessarily included in this advisory. For some NYPD disciplinary matters in which a departmental trial was held for an officer, the decision in the trial is included in the NYPD database under the "Documents" tab for that officer

Any information herein regarding civil lawsuits against an officer is not necessarily a complete list of civil lawsuits in which that officer is a defendant.

Allegations of misconduct that have not been substantiated and are not pending (including, but not limited to, findings of unsubstantiated, unfounded, and exonerated), and allegations of technical infractions, are not subject to disclosure and are not included in this advisory.

The decision to include information in this advisory does not represent a conclusion by the People that it is required to be disclosed.

The People reserve the right to oppose or move to limit the use of any information included herein or disclosed in the future.

If you have any questions, please contact the Assistant District Attorney assigned to the case on which you are receiving this advisory.

Date: October 6, 2021